UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/457,889	12/10/1999	GERMANO CARONNI	6502.0283	8181

22852 7590 07/06/2004

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW, GARRETT & DUNNER LLP
1300 I STREET, NW
WASHINGTON, DC 20005

EXAMINER	
MOLINARI, MICHAEL J	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2665	29

DATE MAILED: 07/06/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/457,889	CARONNI ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Michael J Molinari	2665	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *09 June 2004*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-24* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-24* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date *25*.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

2. Claim 21 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Teraoka et al. ("A Network Architecture Providing Host Migration Transparency").

3. Referring to claim 21, Teraoka et al. disclose a data processing system for communicating in a network with a source node and a destination node, wherein the source node and the destination node have an address, the data processing system comprising: means for accessing an address of the destination node (see page 213, column 1, lines 16-22); means for sending a first packet by the source node to the destination node by using the accessed address (see page 213, column 1, lines 16-22); means for receiving the first packet by the destination node at the address of the destination node (at the native network of the node, see page 213, column 1, lines 16-22, see also Section 4.2 and Figure 2); means for updating the accessed address responsive to a change in the address of the destination node to a new address (see page 213, column 1, lines 33-35), wherein the updating means includes: means for sending an update packet containing the new address of the destination node (see page 213, column 1, lines 41-43) from the destination node such that the update packet is always sent to the source node (Reply, see page 213, column 1, lines 33-35), and means for storing, by the source node, the new address

of the destination node, responsive to receiving the update packet (see page 213, column 1, lines 33-35); means for sending a second packet by the source node to the destination node by using the stored new address (see page 213, column 1, lines 35-36); and means for receiving the second packet by the destination node at the new address of the destination node (see page 213, column 1, lines 35-36).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 1-2, 4, 7-9, 11, 14-15, 17-18, 20, 22, and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Teraoka et al. ("A Network Architecture Providing Host Migration Transparency") in view of Short et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,130,892).

6. Referring to claim 1, Teraoka et al. disclose a method in a distributed system for communicating in a network with a source node and a destination node, the method comprising the steps of: accessing an address of the destination node by the source node (see page 213, column 1, lines 19-20); sending a first packet by the source node to the destination node by using the accessed address (see page 213, column 1, lines 16-22); receiving the first packet by the destination node at the accessed address of the destination node (At the native network of the node, see page 213, column 1, lines 16-22, see also Section 4.2 and Figure 2); updating the accessed address responsive to a change in the address of the destination node to a new address

(see page 213, column 1, lines 33-35) wherein the updating includes sending an update packet containing the new address of the destination node (see page 213, column 1, lines 41-43) from the destination node such that the update packet is always sent to the source node (Reply, see page 213, column 1, lines 33-35), and storing, by the source node, the new address of the destination node, responsive to receiving the update packet (see page 213, column 1, lines 33-35 and lines 45-54); sending a second packet by the source node to the destination node by using the stored new address (see page 213, column 1, lines 35-36); and receiving the second packet by the destination node at the new address of the destination node (see page 213, column 1, lines 35-36). Teraoka et al. differ from claim 1 in that they fail to disclose that the source node and destination node are software. However, implementing routers as software is well known in the art. For example, Short et al. teach that routers can be implemented as software and/or hardware (see column 2, lines 29-30), which has the advantage of adding flexibility to the network design. One skilled in the art would have recognized the advantage of being able to implement routers using software and/or hardware as taught by Short et al. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person with ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the use of software and/or hardware for routers as taught by Short et al. into the invention of Teraoka et al. to achieve the advantage of adding flexibility to the network design.

7. Referring to claim 2, Teraoka et al. disclose that the source node and the destination node have a local address cache, and wherein the receiving the first packet step includes the step of: storing, in the local cache of the destination node, an address of the sending node (see page 213, lines 24-25, note that in receiving the query and then using the address received to respond, the receiving node would either already have the sending node's address in its address table or

would add the address in the received packet to its address table); and wherein the updating step further includes the steps of: retrieving from the local cache of the destination node the address of the sending node (see page 213, lines 33-35, noting that outgoing packets are addressed based on what is stored in the routing table of the router); and storing, in the local cache of the source node, the new address of the destination node (see page 213, lines 33-35).

8. Referring to claim 4, Teraoka et al. disclose that the source node and the destination node communicate with other nodes by using a multicast address (in IP networks all subnets have a multicast address. In the event that two hosts start out on the same subnet, they would be able to communicate with each other by using a mutlicast address) such that a communication sent to the multicast address is sent to the source node, the destination node, and the other nodes, the source node and the other nodes having a local cache, wherein the updating step further includes the steps of: sending the update packet containing the new address of the destination node to the source node by the destination node using the multicast address; receiving the update packet by the source node and the other nodes; and storing in the local cache of the source node and the other nodes the new address of the destination node (see page 214, lines 2-10).

9. Referring to claim 7, Teraoka et al. disclose that the change in the address of the destination node to the new address is caused by a device on which the destination node runs physically changing locations (see page 213, lines 19-20 and lines 24-25).

10. Referring to claim 8, Teraoka et al. disclose a method in a distributed system for communicating in a network with a source node and a destination node, wherein the source node and the destination node have an address, the method comprising the steps of: receiving the first packet by the destination node, at an address of the destination node, from the source node, the

packet being addressed to the address of the destination node (see page 213, column 1, lines 16-20 and see Section 4.2 and Figure 2. Note that the destination node is originally in its native network.); updating the address of the destination node to a new address responsive to a change in the address of the destination node to the new address (see page 213, column 1, lines 33-36) wherein the updating includes sending an update packet containing the new address of the destination node (see page 213, column 1, lines 41-43) from the destination node such that the update packet is always sent to the source node (Reply, see page 213, column 1, lines 33-35), and storing, by the source node, the new address of the destination node, responsive to receiving the update packet (see page 213, column 1, lines 33-35 and lines 45-54); and receiving a second packet by the destination node at the new address (see page 213, lines 33-35). Teraoka et al. differ from claim 8 in that they fail to disclose that the routers can be implemented as software. However, implementing routers as software is well known in the art. For example, Short et al. teach that routers can be implemented as software and/or hardware (see column 2, lines 29-30), which has the advantage of adding flexibility to the network design. One skilled in the art would have recognized the advantage of being able to implement routers using software and/or hardware as taught by Short et al. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person with ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the use of software routers as taught by Short et al. into the invention of Teraoka et al. to achieve the advantage of adding flexibility to the network design.

11. Referring to claim 9, Teraoka et al. disclose that the destination node has a local address cache, and wherein the receiving first packet step includes the step of: storing, in the local cache of the destination node, an address of the sending node (see page 213, lines 24-25, note that in

receiving the query and then using the address received to respond, the receiving node would either already have the sending node's address in its address table or would add the address in the received packet to its address table); and wherein the updating step further includes the step of: retrieving from the local cache of the destination node the address of the sending node (see page 213, lines 33-35, noting that outgoing packets are addressed based on what is stored in the routing table of the router).

12. Referring to claim 11, Teraoka et al. disclose that the source node and the destination node communicate with other nodes by using a multicast address (in IP networks all subnets have a multicast address. In the event that two hosts start out on the same subnet, they would be able to communicate with each other by using a multicast address) such that a communication sent to the multicast address is sent to the source node, the destination node, and the other nodes, the source node and the other nodes having a local cache, and wherein the updating step further includes the step of: sending the update packet containing the new address of the destination node to the source node by the destination node using the multicast address (see page 214, lines 2-10).

13. Referring to claim 14, Teraoka et al. disclose that the change in the address of the destination node to the new address is caused by a device on which the destination node runs physically changing locations (see page 213, lines 19-20 and lines 24-25).

14. Referring to claim 15, Teraoka et al. disclose a method in a data processing system for communicating in a network with a source node and a destination node, wherein each node has an address, the method comprising the steps of: sending a first packet from the source node to the destination node by using the address of the destination node (see page 213, column 1, lines 16-

22); receiving, by the source node, an update packet sent by the destination node such that the update packet is always sent to the source node, the update packet containing a new address to supersede the address of the destination node responsive to a change in the address of the destination node to the new address (Reply, see page 213, column 1, lines 33-35); storing, by the source node, the new address of the destination node, responsive to receiving the update packet (see page 213, column 1, lines 33-35 and lines 45-54); and sending a second packet from the source node to the destination node by using the new address (see page 213, lines 35-36). Teraoka et al. differ from claim 1 in that they fail to disclose that the routers can be implemented as software. However, implementing routers as software is well known in the art. For example, Short et al. teach that routers can be implemented as software and/or hardware (see column 2, lines 29-30), which has the advantage of adding flexibility to the network design. One skilled in the art would have recognized the advantage of being able to implement routers using software and/or hardware as taught by Short et al. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person with ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the use of software and/or hardware for routers as taught by Short et al. into the invention of Teraoka et al. to achieve the advantage of adding flexibility to the network design.

15. Referring to claim 17, Teraoka et al. disclose that the change in the address of the destination node to the new address is caused by a device on which the destination node runs physically changing locations (see page 213, lines 19-20 and lines 24-25).

16. Referring to claim 18, Teraoka et al. disclose a distributed system with a plurality of devices, comprising: a first of the devices comprising: a source node that sends a first packet to a destination node using an address of the destination node (see page 213, lines 16-22), that

receives an update packet (Reply, see page 213, column 1, lines 33-35) from the destination node containing a new address to supersede the address of the destination node responsive to a change in the address of the destination node to the new address (see page 213, column 1, lines 33-35), and that sends a second packet to the destination node using the new address (see page 213, column 1, lines 35-36); and a second device comprising: a destination node that receives the first packet at the address and that sends the update packet containing the new address such that the update packet is always sent to the source node in response to the change in the address of the destination node to the new address (see page 213, column 1, lines 33-35), and that receives the second packet (see page 213, column 1, lines 35-36). Teraoka et al. differ from claim 1 in that they fail to disclose that the routers can be implemented as software. However, implementing routers as software is well known in the art. For example, Short et al. teach that routers can be implemented as software and/or hardware (see column 2, lines 29-30), which has the advantage of adding flexibility to the network design. One skilled in the art would have recognized the advantage of being able to implement routers using software and/or hardware as taught by Short et al. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person with ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the use of software and/or hardware for routers as taught by Short et al. into the invention of Teraoka et al. to achieve the advantage of adding flexibility to the network design.

17. Referring to claim 20, Teraoka et al. disclose that the change in the address of the destination node to the new address is caused by a device on which the destination node runs physically changing locations (see page 213, column 1, lines 19-20 and lines 24-25).

18. Referring to claim 22, Teraoka et al. disclose a computer-readable medium containing instructions for controlling a data processing system to perform a method, the method for communicating in a network with a source node and a destination node, wherein each node has an address, the method comprising the steps of: sending a first packet from the source node to the destination node by using the address of the destination node (see page 213, column 1, lines 16-22); receiving, by the source node, an update packet (Reply, see page 213, column 1, lines 33-35) sent by the destination node such that the update packet is always sent to the source node, the update packet containing a new address to supersede the address of the destination node responsive to a change in the address of the destination node to the new address (see page 213, column 1, lines 33-35); and sending a second packet by the source node to the destination node by using the new address (see page 213, column 1, lines 35-36). Teraoka et al. differ from claim 22 in that they fail to disclose that the routers can be implemented as software. However, implementing routers as software is well known in the art. For example, Short et al. teach that routers can be implemented as software and/or hardware (see column 2, lines 29-30), which has the advantage of adding flexibility to the network design. One skilled in the art would have recognized the advantage of being able to implement routers using software and/or hardware as taught by Short et al. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person with ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the use of software and/or hardware for routers as taught by Short et al. into the invention of Teraoka et al. to achieve the advantage of adding flexibility to the network design.

19. Referring to claim 24, Teraoka et al. disclose that the change in the address of the destination node to the new address is caused by a device on which the destination node runs physically changing locations (see page 213, column 1, lines 19-20 and lines 24-25).

20. Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Teraoka et al. in view of Short et al. as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Forman et al. ("The Challenges of Mobile Computing").

21. Referring to claim 3, Teraoka et al. in view of Short et al. disclose the method of claim 1 and teach the use of central address store to manage the addresses of mobile hosts (name server, see page 210, column 2, line 35), but differ from claim 3 in that they fail to disclose a method of updating such a central address store. However, the use of central address stores for maintaining location information about mobile hosts and a method of updating them is well known in the art. For example, Forman et al. disclose the use of a central address store, the method further comprising the steps of: storing the address of the source node and the destination node in the central address store; and wherein the sending a first packet step further includes the step of: accessing the address of the destination node from the central address store; and wherein the updating step further includes the steps of: sending a third packet containing the new address of the destination node to the central address store by the destination node; and storing the new address of the destination node in the central address store; and accessing the new address by the source node (see pages 8-9, "Central Services"), which has the advantage of making it easier to keep track of mobile hosts. One skilled in the art would have recognized the advantage of using a central address store as taught by Forman et al. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person with ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the use of a central

address store into the invention of Teraoka et al. in view of Short et al. to achieve the advantage of making it easier to keep track of mobile hosts.

22. Claims 5 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Teraoka et al. ("A Network Architecture Providing Host Migration Transparency") in view of Short et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,130,892), further in view of Francis et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,331,637).

23. Referring to claim 5, Teraoka et al. in view of Short et al. differ from claim 5 in that they fail to disclose that the source node and the destination node communicate using multicast and that they join multicast groups. However, multicast communication is old and well known in the art. For example, Francis et al. teach a method for routing multicast packets in a network in which the nodes communicate by using a multicast address such that a communication sent to the multicast address is sent to a multicast group including the source node and the destination node (see column 6, lines 28-30) and a method for a node to join a multicast group by sending a join request to a router (see column 5, lines 57-60), which has the advantage of being a more efficient means of delivering communication between a large group of users than using unicast communication. One skilled in the art would have recognized the advantage of using multicast as taught by Francis et al. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person with ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the use of multicast communication as taught by Francis et al. into the invention of Teraoka et al. to achieve the advantage of distributing information to a large group of users more efficiently.

24. Referring to claim 12, Teraoka et al. in view of Short et al. differ from claim 12 in that they fail to disclose that the source node and the destination node communicate using multicast and that they join multicast groups. However, multicast communication is old and well known

in the art. For example, Francis et al. teach a method for routing multicast packets in a network in which the nodes communicate by using a multicast address such that a communication sent to the multicast address is sent to a multicast group including the source node and the destination node (see column 6, lines 28-30) and a method for a node to join a multicast group by sending a join request to a router (see column 5, lines 57-60), which has the advantage of being a more efficient means of delivering communication between a large group of users than using unicast communication. One skilled in the art would have recognized the advantage of using multicast as taught by Francis et al. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person with ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the use of multicast communication as taught by Francis et al. into the invention of Teraoka et al. to achieve the advantage of distributing information to a large group of users more efficiently.

25. Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Teraoka et al. in view of Short as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of V-One Corporation ("V-One's Smartgate VPN").

26. Referring to claim 6, Teraoka et al. in view of Short et al. disclose the method of claim 1 but differ from claim 6 in that they do not disclose that the network is a private network running on a public network infrastructure. However, the use of private networks over a public network infrastructure is well known in the art. For example, V-One Corporation teaches the use of VPNs, which have the advantage of extending the reach of a normal network by using the public network infrastructure. One skilled in the art would have recognized the advantage of using a VPN as taught by V-One Corporation. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person with ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the use of VPNs as taught by

V-One Corporation into the invention of Teraoka et al. in view of Short et al. to achieve the advantage of extending the reach of a normal network by using the public network infrastructure.

27. Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Teraoka et al. in view of Short et al. as applied to claim 8 above, and further in view of Forman et al. ("The Challenges of Mobile Computing").

28. Referring to claim 10, Teraoka et al. in view of Short et al. disclose the method of claim 8 and teach the use of central address store to manage the addresses of mobile hosts (name server, see page 210, column 2, lines 35), but differ from claim 10 in that they fail to disclose a method of updating such a central store. However, the use of central address stores for maintaining location about mobile hosts and a method of updating them is well known in the art. For example, Forman et al. disclose the use of a central address store, the method further comprising the steps of: storing an address of the source node and an address of the destination node in the central address store; and wherein the updating step further includes the step of: sending a third packet containing the new address of the destination node to the central address store by the destination node (see pages 8-9, "Central Services"), which has the advantage of making it easier to keep track of mobile hosts. One skilled in the art would have recognized the advantage of using a central address store as taught by Forman et al. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person with ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the use of a central address store into the invention of Teraoka et al. in view of Short et al. to achieve the advantage of making it easier to keep track of mobile hosts.

29. Claim 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Teraoka et al. in view of Short as applied to claim 8 above, and further in view of V-One Corporation ("V-One's Smartgate VPN").

30. Referring to claim 13, Teraoka et al. in view of Short et al. disclose the method of claim 8 but differ from claim 13 in that they do not disclose that the network is a private network running on a public network infrastructure. However, the use of private networks over a public network infrastructure is well known in the art. For example, V-One Corporation teaches the use of VPNs, which have the advantage of extending the reach of a normal network by using the public network infrastructure. One skilled in the art would have recognized the advantage of using a VPN as taught by V-One Corporation. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person with ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the use of VPNs as taught by V-One Corporation into the invention of Teraoka et al. in view of Short et al. to achieve the advantage of extending the reach of a normal network by using the public network infrastructure.

31. Claim 16 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Teraoka et al. in view of Short as applied to claim 15 above, and further in view of V-One Corporation ("V-One's Smartgate VPN").

32. Referring to claim 16, Teraoka et al. in view of Short et al. disclose the method of claim 15 but differ from claim 16 in that they do not disclose that the network is a private network running on a public network infrastructure. However, the use of private networks over a public network infrastructure is well known in the art. For example, V-One Corporation teaches the use of VPNs, which have the advantage of extending the reach of a normal network by using the public network infrastructure. One skilled in the art would have recognized the advantage of

using a VPN as taught by V-One Corporation. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person with ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the use of VPNs as taught by V-One Corporation into the invention of Teraoka et al. in view of Short et al. to achieve the advantage of extending the reach of a normal network by using the public network infrastructure.

33. Claim 19 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Teraoka et al. in view of Short as applied to claim 18 above, and further in view of V-One Corporation ("V-One's Smartgate VPN").

34. Referring to claim 19, Teraoka et al. in view of Short et al. disclose the method of claim 18 but differ from claim 19 in that they do not disclose that the network is a private network running on a public network infrastructure. However, the use of private networks over a public network infrastructure is well known in the art. For example, V-One Corporation teaches the use of VPNs, which have the advantage of extending the reach of a normal network by using the public network infrastructure. One skilled in the art would have recognized the advantage of using a VPN as taught by V-One Corporation. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person with ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the use of VPNs as taught by V-One Corporation into the invention of Teraoka et al. in view of Short et al. to achieve the advantage of extending the reach of a normal network by using the public network infrastructure.

35. Claim 23 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Teraoka et al. in view of Short as applied to claim 22 above, and further in view of V-One Corporation ("V-One's Smartgate VPN").

36. Referring to claim 23, Teraoka et al. in view of Short et al. disclose the method of claim 22 but differ from claim 23 in that they do not disclose that the network is a private network running on a public network infrastructure. However, the use of private networks over a public network infrastructure is well known in the art. For example, V-One Corporation teaches the use of VPNs, which have the advantage of extending the reach of a normal network by using the public network infrastructure. One skilled in the art would have recognized the advantage of using a VPN as taught by V-One Corporation. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person with ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the use of VPNs as taught by V-One Corporation into the invention of Teraoka et al. in view of Short et al. to achieve the advantage of extending the reach of a normal network by using the public network infrastructure.

Response to Arguments

37. Applicant's arguments filed 9 June 2004 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

38. The examiner acknowledges that an interview took place on 23 March 2004 and that the examiner did state that the claim language that was submitted by Applicant should overcome the prior art of record, particularly the Teraoka et al. reference. However, upon further review of the Teraoka et al. reference during preparation of this office action, the examiner has noted that Teraoka et al. provide multiple means of sending an update packet from a destination node, which has moved to a source node, the update packet providing an updated address of the destination node to the source node. The interpretation relied upon in previous office actions centered around Sections 4.1 and 4.2 and Figure 2. Specifically, the means of sending an update

packet was through the use of Connection Notification packet, as described on page 214, column 1, lines 2-10. However, it appears that Teraoka et al. also teach an additional means of transmitting an update packet from the destination node to the source node that contains the same claimed information (the new address of the destination node). On page 213, in column 1, Teraoka et al. disclose that the destination node sends a reply to the source node (see lines 33-36) that the source node learns the new address of the destination node. Furthermore, Teraoka et al. teach that the reply packet must contain the address of the destination (see page 213, column 1, lines 41-43) and that this results in a change in an address mapping table of the source node (see page 213, column 1, lines 45-54).

39. The examiner regrets that this interpretation of the Teraoka et al. reference was not discussed during the interview and apologizes for any inconvenience. However, as this alternate interpretation of the Teraoka et al. does teach the claimed invention as recited in the amended claims, the examiner must maintain the rejection under Teraoka et al. If Applicant has any concerns regarding the rejection or the interpretation of Teraoka et al. relied upon in making the rejection, Applicant may contact the examiner.

Conclusion

40. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Michael J Molinari whose telephone number is (703) 305-5742. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday 8am-6:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Huy Vu can be reached on (703) 308-6602. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

MJM

Michael Joseph Molinari

DUC HO
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Duc Ho

6-30-04